



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/824,126	04/14/2004	Gian De Belder	CM2737M	6441
27752 7590 11/27/2009 THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY Global Legal Department - IP Sycamore Building - 4th Floor 299 East Sixth Street CINCINNATI, OH 45202				
EXAMINER				
WEBB, GREGORY E				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
1796				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/27/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/824,126

Applicant(s)

DE BELDER ET AL.

Examiner

Gregory E. Webb

Art Unit

1796

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 August 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-21 and 24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-21 and 24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/GS/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 8/10/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. The applicant has amended the claims to now require a Markush group defining specific fragrance delivery means.
3. The applicant argues that the prior art fails to teach or suggest the newly added requirement for the fragrance delivery system. Although the examiner agrees the primary reference fail to teach the claimed delivery system, the examiner has also relied upon the Leonard et al (US 6,662,380) reference. The '380 reference clearly teaches the applicant's limitation directed to a wick delivery system. For example Leonard teaches the following in claim 1:

1. A dispensing device for using a flow of water during a toilet flush to dispense toilet bowl treatment preparations into a toilet bowl, the device comprising: a bottle for holding a liquid, the bottle having a mouth and a closure for covering the mouth; a base for holding the bottle, the base having a piercing post, the piercing post being suitable for opening the closure of the bottle; **a wicking device supported by the base, the wicking device being suitable to convey the liquid from the piercing post to a dispensing position within the flow of water during a toilet flush**; a container attached to the base, the container holding a dissolvable product, the container being

configured to permit water from the flow of water to enter the container during a toilet flush, and the container including an opening configured to permit a mixture comprising water and dissolved product to be released from the container into the toilet bowl; and suspension means for suspending the base from a rim of the toilet bowl.

4. Clearly this reference teaches each of the required elements including the container (i.e. bottle), the dispensing means (i.e. the container holding a dissolvable product, the container being configured to permit water from the flow of water to enter the container during a toilet flush), and the fragrance delivery component (i.e. wicking device).
5. Finally, it should also be noted that the applicant makes numerous arguments regarding the "separate fragrance delivery component." The applicant also states that the instant claims require "dual benefit of lavatory bowl cleaning and a separate fragrance source that provide a prolonged scent benefit."
6. Nowhere in the claims does the applicant use the language "separate fragrance" nor does the applicant use the language "separate fragrance source."
7. Reading the instant claims, it is not clear to the examiner that the claim is limited to "a separate fragrance source," as the claims never use this language. Claim 1 requires a perfume-containing composition. The examiner does not see any reference to a second/separate fragrance source. It is suggested the applicant more clearly define the multiple fragrance sources in the claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

4. Claims 1-3, 5-21 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leonard et al (US 6,178,564) and further in view of Leonard et al (US 6,662,380) and further in view of Purzycki (US 4,666,671) and further in view of Redford (US 5,210,884).
5. Leonard'564 teaches a liquid dispenser for dispensing a liquid from the rim of a toilet bowl in a controlled and consistent manner. Figure 1 clearly shows the support structure, the dispensing means, rim attachment means, and the container holding a liquid.
6. Specifically concerning the dispensing means and the attachment means, Leonard'564 teaches the following:

"In a preferred form of the second version of the invention, the liquid dispenser is suitable for dispensing a liquid from the rim of a toilet bowl. In this form, the suspension means comprise a suspension hook and a guide channel integral with the base. The suspension hook has an upper end hook portion that is placed over the toilet rim and a lower end that is slidably inserted in the guide channel such that the lower end of the suspension hook engages an inner surface of the guide channel thereby suspending the base and the bottle under or adjacent the toilet rim. In this preferred form, the dispensing plate is suitable to be upwardly inclined with respect to an inner surface of the toilet bowl when the liquid dispenser is installed on the rim of the toilet bowl, and the lower plate is also suitable to be upwardly inclined with respect to an inner surface of the toilet bowl when the liquid dispenser is installed on the rim of the toilet bowl. The spacing between the upper surface of the dispensing plate and the lower plate of the base varies along the length of the dispensing plate such that a first spacing between the edge of the lower plate nearest the inner surface of the toilet bowl and the edge of the dispensing plate nearest the inner surface of the toilet bowl is less than a second spacing between the edge of the lower plate furthest from the inner surface of the toilet bowl and the edge of the dispensing plate furthest from the inner surface of the toilet bowl. The dispensing plate may also include a deflector secured to an edge of the dispensing plate. The deflector is dimensioned so as to be suitable to contact an inner surface of the toilet bowl when the liquid dispenser is installed on the rim of the toilet bowl. When the toilet is

flushed, a portion of the flushing water contacts a dispensing position on the upper surface of the dispensing plate thereby washing the liquid into the flush water." (*emphasis added*)

Concerning the fragrance and the flush water and means of dispensing, Leonard'564 teaches the following:

The use of the capillary dispensing method implemented by the liquid dispenser 10 in accordance with the invention provides for delivery of a linear and consistent amount of liquid formula to the flush water. One embodiment of the liquid dispenser is designed to last between 300 and 450 flushes, providing consistent foaming, cleaning, disinfecting and fragranting at each flush, from the first flush to the last flush. It has been discovered that the use of capillary channels on the dispensing plate is very significant in delivering a steady level of fragrance between flushes as the surface area for the capillary channels insures that adequate fragrance is delivered to the atmosphere after each flush. (*emphasis added*)

Concerning the plastic material, Leonard'564 teaches the following:

At the bottom of the base 24, there is a liquid dispensing plate 40 that assists in distribution of the liquid formula into the flush water. The dispensing plate 40 may be a separate component that is attached to the base or may be formed integral with the base 24. The dispensing plate 40 is preferably formed from a non-porous **thermoplastic material** such as pigmented **polyethylene** or **polypropylene**. (*emphasis added*)

7. Leonard'564 fails to teach a liquid dispensing system in combination with a fragranced gel type fragrance dispensing system.
8. Although Leonard does not teach the combination of features, such features were known at the time of the instant invention.
9. In Leonard'380, a dual system exists where both a liquid and solid are dispensed into the flush water (see abstract). Leonard'380 further teaches the wicking delivery system the rim attachment.
10. Leonard teaches various material that may be used in forming the solid dissolvable cleaning product including bleaching agents, gelling agents. Leonard

further addresses the need for a device that can dispense quantities of cleaning and freshening liquid both during and after a flush (see col. 2, lines 22-40).

11. The two Leonard references fail to teach the specific gel state and the use of terpenes as a fragrance.

12. Purzycki also teaches rim blocks and specifically teaches gelled solid blocks.

Purzycki also teaches the use of terpenes as a common fragrance as well as dispensing the fragrance during flushes.

Concerning the lavatory bowl, toilet bowl rim and the fragrance, Purzycki teaches the following:

The **solid gel urinal and toilet bowl rim blocks** of this invention have several advantages over the sublimable blocks or the molded surfactant blocks described in the prior art. The gels of this invention can perform for up to thirty days or longer continuously emitting a pleasant fragrance while at the same time releasing other active ingredients into the toilet bowl or urinal. Another advantage is that the fragrance used need not be overwhelming in order to cover over undesirable odors due to volatile materials such as para-dichlorobenzene. The fragrance used can provide a delicate and pleasant odor more suitable and desirable for the lavatory or bathroom. A third advantage is that the release of the fragrance and the other active ingredients is controlled and quite linear over about thirty days and there is no rapid decline of effectiveness with time. (*emphasis added*)

Concerning the terpene, Purzycki teaches the following:

The fragrance in the gel of this invention can be **any conventional commercially available perfume oil**. These are complex mixtures of volatile compounds including: esters, ethers, aldehydes, alcohols, unsaturated hydrocarbons, **terpenes** and other ingredients which are well known to those skilled in the art of perfumery. Their use as to type and proportion is limited only by their compatibility and preference in the gel matrix. It is one of the advantages of this invention that a wide variety of fragrance components are compatible with the gel system and one can choose from a wide variety of fragrances. (*emphasis added*)

Concerning the flush water, Purzycki teaches the following:

A preferred container for toilet bowls will **divert a portion of the flush water and allow a portion to come in contact with the gel**. There should also be provision for the active ingredients to escape. The

container can be manufactured out of any suitable material and should provide a holding device which positions the container under the rim in the stream of flushing water. (*emphasis added*)

13. Although the Purzycki and Leonard references fail to teach the use of an electrical delivery system, such systems were also well known at the time of filing.
14. Redford teaches environmental controlled toilets and teaches delivery systems using electrical pumps and detectors as can be seen in fig. 21. Redford teaches the benefit of such a system to avoid embarrassment and provide a pleasant environment (see col 13, lines 1-24).

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Gregory E. Webb whose telephone number is 571-272-1325. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-17:30 (m-f).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon can be reached on 571-272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Gregory E. Webb/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796

Gregory E. Webb
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1796

gew